REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6, 12-13, 16, 18-20, 22, 24-27, 35, 38-39, 43, 46-47, 58-61 and 69-72 are pending in the Application.

Claims 1-3, 6, 12-13, 16, 18-20, 22, 24-27, 35, 38-39, 43, 46-47, 58-61 and 69-72 stand rejected.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the Specification in such a way to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The Examiner asserts that the phrase "all or a portion of the call" is not clearly defined. The Examiner asserts that this phrase is broad enough to cover everything related to the call including the ring signals. In response, Applicants have amended claim 18 in a manner believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 35, 38-39, 43 and 46-47 depend upon cancelled claims. In response, Applicants have cancelled these claims.

II. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 22 recites the limitation "single processing means" in claim 1 but there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation. Applicants have cancelled claim 22.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 6, 13, 16, 18-20, 22, 24-27, 35, 43, 58-61, 69, 71 and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Sharma et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,452,289). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As the Examiner is well aware, for a claim to be anticipated under § 102, each and every element must be found within the cited reference.

On pages 3-4, paragraph 4, of Paper No. 7, the Examiner has rejected all of these claims with a single paragraph, which is clearly not sufficient to prove a *prima facie* case of anticipation. In doing so, the Examiner has not clearly set for the rejections of each and every one of the rejected claims. This is an improper rejection, and fails to set forth the proper grounds for why each one of these claims is rejected under § 102.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner also asserts that *Sharma* is controlled by a single microprocessor. In response, Applicants respectfully assert that this is not how *Sharma* works. It is quite clear in *Sharma* that there are at least two microprocessors/ microcontrollers operating the entire system illustrated in Fig. 1, since *Sharma* specifically states that functions of the hardware components in Fig. 3 are controlled by control software operating within the hardware component and from the software components operating within the personal computer (which quite naturally will have a microprocessor contained therein). *See* Column 1, lines 50-54. This is also supported in Column 9, lines 11-13, wherein *Sharma* teaches that the software components of the system communicate with the hardware components in Fig. 3 via the RS232 serial interface circuit 315. Columns 9 through 14 then go on to describe the various functions illustrated in Fig. 2 (e.g., the telephone, voice mail, fax manager, multi-media mail, show and tell, terminal, and address book functions) that are all implemented in the hardware components of Fig. 3 using the software implemented within the personal computer 10. As an example, the telephone function 115 is implemented by the user either selecting a telephone number to be dialed from the address book 127 or manually selecting the number through the telephone menu on the personal computer 10. Column 9, lines 25-29. The telephone number to be dialed is then downloaded from the personal computer over the serial interface 315 and received by the main controller 313 which causes the data pump DSP circuit 311 to seize the telephone line and transmit the DTMF tones to dial the number. Column 9, lines 29-24. Thus, it is quite clear that the switching circuitry and voice processing circuitry described in *Sharma* are controlled by two microprocessor/microcontrollers, one in the PC 10, and microcontroller 313. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Sharma*.

Claim 6 is similar to claim 1, except that claim 6 recites that switching circuitry and the voice processing circuitry are controlled by a single processing means. Claim 6 then

further recites that the single processing means is controlled by a single set of software operable for controlling both the switching circuitry and the voice processing circuitry. For much of the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that *Sharma* does not anticipate claim 6, since it is quite clear that a processor operating within PC 10 and the controller 313 do not comprise a single processing means. Furthermore, *Sharma* clearly teaches that more than a single set of software is controlling the functions of the switching circuitry and the voice processing circuitry, since *Sharma* teaches that the hardware components are controlled by a control software operating within the hardware components and are controlled from the software components operating with the personal computer. Column 1, lines 50-54. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that *Sharma* teaches that not only are there two processing means for controlling the switching circuitry and the voice processing circuitry in *Sharma*, but more than one set of software is implemented within the PC 10 and within the programmable and electrically erasable read only memory (PEROM) circuit 317. *Sharma* teaches in column 9, lines 7-10 that the PEROM circuit 317 includes non-volatile memory in which are stored the executable control programs for the voice control DSP circuits 306 and the main controller circuits 313.

Claims 13 and 16 also recite the single processing means, and therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 13 and 16 are also not anticipated by *Sharma* for the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 6.

Claim 19 is dependent upon claim 18, which is dependent upon claim 1. Since Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, therefore, claim 19 is also patentable. Nevertheless, Applicants also respectfully assert that claim 19 is patentable over *Sharma*, since the circuitry for recording all or a portion of the call after the telecommunications device is connected to the call, which operates and responds to a tactilely initiated activating signal, is not taught within *Sharma*. In contrast, Applicants respectfully assert that *Sharma* teaches that the recording of an incoming call is done automatically, entirely without the requirement for any tactilely initiated activating signal. *Sharma* teaches that an incoming telephone call is received and a pre-recorded message is then sent by the personal computer 10 through the RS232 interface 315 to the main controller circuit 313, which then passes it on to the DSP circuit 306, which results in analog voice

patterns that are passed through the multiplexor circuit 310 to the telephone line interface 309 for transmission to the caller. Column 10, lines 10-28. Such a message may invite the caller to leave a voice message at the sound of a tone. Any resultant incoming voice messages that are received through the telephone line interface 309 and passed through the voice control circuit 306 are then sent through the RAM circuit 308 and the main controller 313 through the RS232 serial interface 315 to the personal computer 10 for storage and later retrieval. Column 10, lines 28-44. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere within *Sharma* is it taught or suggested that an incoming call can be recorded in response to a tactilely initiated activating signal.

For the same reason as given above with respect to claim 19, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 25 is also not anticipated by *Sharma*. Even more specifically, it is quite clear that nowhere within *Sharma* is a recording of a voice signal from a telephone extension activated in a tactilely initiated manner by a user of a telephone extension.

Claim 27 *also* recites that the switching circuitry and the voice processing circuitry are controlled by a single processing means. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 27 is not anticipated by *Sharma* for the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 6. Furthermore, claim 27 recites that a recording sequence to record a voice signal at a telephone extension coupled to the system is activated in a tactile manner by a user of the telephone extension. For the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 19, Applicants therefore assert that claim 27 is not anticipated by *Sharma*. Claim 27 further recites circuitry for listening to a voice signal at a telephone extension coupled to the system, wherein this voice signal is recorded by the activated recording sequence, and that the voice signal originates from a voice mail message stored in the system. Applicants respectfully assert that this claim limitation is not taught or suggested anywhere within *Sharma*. Furthermore, Applicant's respectfully assert that the Examiner's rejection in paragraph 4, page 3 of Paper No. 7 does not specifically address this claim limitation, and therefore the Examiner has failed to prove a *prima facie* showing of anticipation in rejecting claim 27.

Claim 58 also recites that the switching circuitry and the voice processing circuitry are controlled by a single processing means. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 58 is not anticipated by *Sharma* for the same reasons as given above with respect to

claim 6. Furthermore, claim 58 recites the steps of listening to a voice signal at a telephone extension coupled to the system, activating a recording sequence to record the voice signal, and storing the recorded voice signal in a memory. Applicants respectfully assert that this is not taught or suggested within *Sharma*. The only recording of voice signals taught by *Sharma* is the receipt of a message through the telephone line interface 309, which is from an external caller, and not from a telephone extension coupled to the system, such as through codec 305.

Claim 59 recites that the activating step of claim 58 is tactilely initiated by a user of the telephone extension. This claim is not anticipated by Sharma for the same reasons as given above, wherein Applicants have asserted that Sharma does not teach in any way the receipt of a tactilely initiated signal from a user of a telephone extension.

Claim 60 recites that the voice signal that is being recorded has originated from a call to the system. Applicants respectfully assert that this claim is not anticipated by Sharma, since Sharma does not provide an ability for a user at the telecommunications devices 301-304 to initiate the recording of a voice signal received at line interface 309 into the memory within the PC 10.

Claim 69 recites that the switching circuitry connects a call to one of a plurality of telecommunications devices coupled to the system. This capability is not in any way taught or suggested within *Sharma*, since *Sharma* merely provides that a single telecommunications device coupled to codec 305 is connected to an incoming call into telephone line interface 309. Note that the plurality of telecommunications devices 301-304 cannot be referred to as such a plurality recited within claim 69, since *Sharma* quite clearly states that these are alternative interfaces connected to the codec circuit 305. Column 8, lines 18-24. Thus, *Sharma* teaches that a user may use, in the alternative, any one of the telephone handset 301, the telephone headset 302, or the microphone 303 and speaker 304, but *Sharma* does not teach that there is any switching capability to connect an incoming call to any one of the three.

Claim 71 is also patentable for the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, nowhere within *Sharma* is it disclosed to have circuitry for listening to a voice signal at a telephone extension coupled to the system, circuitry for activating a

recorded sequence to record the voice signal, and circuitry for storing the recorded voice signal in a digital memory. Furthermore, the Examiner has not specifically addressed these claim limitations.

With respect to claim 72, this claim is patentable over *Sharma* for the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, *Sharma* does not in any way disclose circuitry for permitting a user of a telephone coupled to the system to monitor a voice mail message while the message is being recorded into the user's mailbox. Furthermore, the Examiner has failed to specifically address this claim limitation.

As a result of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that all of the Claims in the application are patentable over the cited prior art.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Sharma* in view of *Daly et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,274,738). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants incorporate the above arguments regarding *Sharma*. Furthermore, TDM chip 44 is not the same as a digital cross-point matrix which is well defined in the art as not being the same as a circuit that performs a time division multiplexing operation, which is what TDM chip 44 does. Time division multiplexing is a technique for transmitting a number of separate data, voice and/or video signals simultaneously over one communications medium by quickly interleaving a piece of each signal one after another. Newton's Telecom Dictionary, Harry Newton, sixteenth edition, page 863. In contrast, a cross-point switch is an array of cross-points wherein one of N inputs is selectively connected to one of M outputs. *See* U.S. Patent No. 5,060,192, col. 1, lines 9-11. *See also* U.S. Patent No. 4,360,809 for another disclosure on a cross-point switch. Therefore, *Sharma* and *Daly* do not teach or suggest such a cross-point switch.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Sharma* in view of *Tsuda* (U.S. Patent No. 5,091,932). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants incorporate the above arguments regarding *Sharma*.

V. CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining Claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request an early allowance of such Claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call Applicants' attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining problems.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: _____
Kelly K. Kordzik
Reg. No. 36,571

5400 Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75270-2199
(512) 370-2851

AUSTIN_1\215492\1
16312-P001C1 05/27/2003